

Serial No. : 10/735,085
Filed : December 12, 2003

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the examiner rejected Claims 1, 4-6, 11 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wan (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0233618). The examiner rejected Claims 2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wan in view of Bharawani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,670,310). The examiner rejected Claims 3, 7, 10, 13, 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wan in view of Sasaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,920,541). The examiner further rejected Claims 9 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wan in view of Bharawani et al. further in view of Stuart (U.S. Patent No. 5,613,110). Accordingly, the applicant has amended the set of claims of the instant application to more clearly differentiate the features of the present invention from the technologies disclosed by the cited references.

More specifically, the applicant has added all of the features in Claim 2 and a part of the features in Claim 7 to Claim 1 and has also added all of the features in Claim 12 and a part of the features in Claim 17 to Claim 11. In the Office Action, the examiner rejected Claims 2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited Wan reference in view of the cited Bharawani et al. reference. In the Office Action, the examiner rejected Claims 7 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited Wan reference in view of the cited Sasaki et al. reference. The applicant respectfully disagrees with

Serial No. : 10/735,085
Filed : December 12, 2003

the examiner regarding the interpretation of the technologies disclosed by the cited references.

In the Office Action, with respect to the features "the supplemental data for each search data in the secondary data file includes a number of counts of the recorded data carrying the search data" in Claims 2 and 12, it is stated that this feature is disclosed by the cited Bharawani et al. reference. In the method the cited Bharawani et al. reference for information storage and retrieval of, the index file 10 contains a frequency count indicating the number of data items identified by the keyword. However, as shown in the file structure of FIG. 1, the information storage and retrieval method of Bharawani et al. utilizes three different files, the index file 10, the search file 12 and the data file 14. The pointer from the index file 10 specifies a particular location of the search file 12, and address data from the search file 12 specifies a particular location of the data file 14 to retrieve the data item. Thus, the file structure disclosed by the cited Bharawani et al. reference is completely different from that of the present invention shown in Figures 5A-5B and 6A-6B.

In the Office Action, with respect to the features "the supplemental data for each search data in the secondary data file includes a difference of offset values between locations of the current recorded data and the next recorded data in the primary data file" in Claims 7 and 17, it is stated that this feature is disclosed by the cited Sasaki et al. reference. As a basis of such

Serial No. : 10/735,085
Filed : December 12, 2003

a disclosure, the examiner points the description at column 6, lines 43-46 of Sasaki et al., which reads as follows:

The disc reproducing apparatus as later described looks to this discriminator 83 to select the specified data to reproduce data indicated by the leading block number 84 and the number of blocks 85.

It appears that the examiner is intended to show that the block number 85 of Sasaki et al. corresponds to the distance between the current location and the next location of the recorded data having the search data in the primary data file of the present invention. However, in the cited Sasaki et al. reference, rather than the difference between the two locations of the search data in the primary data file, the block number 85 appears to show the number of blocks from the literature supervising block as described at column 5, lines 60-63 which reads as follows:

The block number 85 is the data indicating over which number of blocks as counted from the literature supervising block the data indicated by the discriminator 834 is recorded.

Although the disclosure of the cited Sasaki et al. reference is not very clear, the block number 85 of Sasaki seems to indicate a location with reference to the literature supervising block 75 in FIG.5. It should be noted that the literature supervising block 75 is a different data area (file) from that of the main text data 66 as shown in FIG. 5 of the cited Sasaki et al. reference. In contrast, the present invention is directed to the difference between the current location and the next location of the recorded data having the search data in the primary data file. In other

Serial No. : 10/735,085
Filed : December 12, 2003

words, the cited Sasaki et al. reference does not show the difference between the same search data within the primary data file but, instead, shows a difference between different types of data extended between different files.

As discussed above, since none of the essential features of the present invention is shown or suggested by the cited references, the applicant believes that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and U.S.C. 103(a) are no longer applicable to the present invention.

In this opportunity, the applicant has amended the specification to correct the minor wording errors therein and to more clearly described the invention. This is to verify that no new matter has been introduced by this amendment.

Under the circumstances, the applicant believes that the present application is in the condition for allowance, and the applicant respectfully requests that the present application be allowed and passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

MURAMATSU & ASSOCIATES

Dated: _____

9/1/06

By: _____



Yasuo Muramatsu
Registration No. 38,684
114 Pacifica, Suite 310
Irvine, CA 92618
(949) 753-1127